

## **REMARKS**

The present Amendment amends claim 1 and leaves claims 2-6 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-6.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, for paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Particularly the Examiner states that the specification did not disclose that the first link group, the second link group, and the third link group are each different from each other. Applicants do not agree since such is indicated in [0012] and [0027] of the present published application. However, to more clearly describe this feature the claims were amended to recite that the first link group, the second link group, and the third link group are not the same. Therefore, Applicants submit that the claims do comply with the written description requirement. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as their invention. Various amendments were made throughout claims 1-6 to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Therefore, this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made throughout claims 1-6 to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Sakamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,557,110). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention

as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Sakamoto whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Particularly, amendments were made to the claims to clearly recite that the present invention provides for data transmission using three links, a data link, a parity link and a check link, wherein the data link, parity link and check link are not the same, and wherein the check link is used for the deskew of the difference of the arrival time between the data stream.

As argued in the Remarks of the March 24, 2009 Amendment, said Remarks incorporated herein by reference, Sakamoto discloses a system in which the parity data and the information data are transmitted through the same link. Attention is directed to Fig. 5 of Sakamoto. As is clear from the teachings in Sakamoto the system includes a mixer circuit for mixing the parity data and the information data. Accordingly, the size of the circuit taught by Sakamoto required to transmit both the parity data and the information data through the same link becomes large.

However, as clear from the above Sakamoto does not teach or suggest data transmission using three links, a data link, a parity link and a check link, wherein the data link, parity link and check link are not the same, and wherein the check link is used for the deskew of the difference of the arrival time between the data stream as in the present invention.

Thus, Sakamoto fails to teach or suggest transmitting only the parity data through the second link group, and transmitting only the error check data through the third link group, wherein the first link group, the second link group, and the third link group are not the same as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Sakamoto fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as recited in the claims and as such does not anticipate, nor render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claims 1-6.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-6 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the Credit Card attached herewith (G&P-5304).

Respectfully submitted,

BRUNDIDGE & STANGER, P.C.

/Carl I. Brundidge/  
Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc  
(703) 684-1470